ı		1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO	
2	WESTERN DIVISION	
3	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
4	UNITED STATES OF AM	: CASE NO. 1:21-CR-0085
5	Pla vs.	intiff, : SENTENCING HEARING
6	TRES GENCO,	: : February 29, 2024
7	Def	: 10:01 a.m. endant. :
8		
9		RANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS HONORABLE SUSAN J. DLOTT, JUDGE
10		
11	APPEARANCES:	
12	For the Plaintiff:	Megan Gaffney-Painter, Esq.
13		Timothy S. Mangan, Esq. Assistant United States Attorneys
14		221 East Fourth Street, Suite 400 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
15	For the Defendant:	
16		Richard W. Monahan, Esq. Federal Public Defender
17		250 East Fifth Street, Suite 350 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
18		
19	Also present:	FBI Special Agent Patrick Andrew Gragan Tres Genco, Defendant
20	Law Clerks:	Jennifer Johnson, Esq.
21	Courtroom Deputy:	William Miller
22	Stenographer:	Lisa Conley Yungblut, RDR, RMR, CRR, CRC
23		United States District Court 100 East Fifth Street
24		Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
25		

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (Proceedings held in open court at 10:01 a.m.) 3 THE DEPUTY: All rise. This court is now in session pursuant to the recess, The Honorable Judge Susan J. 4 5 Dlott presiding. Please be seated. United States of 6 America versus Tres Genco, Case No. 1:21-CR-85. 7 THE COURT: Good morning to everyone. Let me ask 8 counsel to please enter their appearances for the record. 9 Ms. Gaffney-Painter. 10 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Good morning, Your Honor. 11 Megan Gaffney-Painter and Tim Mangan on behalf of the United 12 States. And with us at counsel's table is Special Agent 13 Patrick Andrew Gragan with the FBI. 14 THE COURT: How does he spell his last name? 15 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: G-R-A-G-A-N. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Monahan. 17 MR. MONAHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Richard 18 Monahan on behalf of the Defendant, Tres Genco, who is 19 seated present with me at counsel table in the custody of 20 the marshals. 21 THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Monahan. 22 And are you Tres Genco? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 2.4 THE COURT: And are you represented in this 25 proceeding by Richard Monahan, an attorney who's present

here in court with you today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: On a former day, the Defendant pleaded guilty to attempted hate crime. At that time the matter was referred to the United States Probation Department for a presentence investigation and report. The Court has received the presentence report prepared April 27th, 2023.

The Court has also received and reviewed the following documents relevant to sentencing: The government's sentencing memorandum filed on June 26th, 2023, which is Document 67; the Defendant's sentencing memorandum filed June 26th, 2023, which is Document 68; letters the Court received on June 26th, 2023 from Tres Genco; Sarah Franks, his mother; David Fulcher, the director of MANA, M-A-N-A; Phillip Charles Nea, N-E-A; and Hung Phung, P-H-U-N-G. The Court has also received a psychological examination report done on the Defendant on October 13th, 2023, which is Document 69.

And the Court -- in addition to that, the Court has also received Defendant's supplemental memorandum that was filed November 3rd, 2023, which is Document 70; the government's supplemental memorandum filed November 6th, 2023, which is Document 71; and, finally, the government's second supplemental sentencing memorandum that was filed yesterday, on February 29th, 2024, it's Document 73, and it

was filed at 9:12 p.m. last night; and the Defendant's response to the government's second supplemental memorandum filed on 2/29/24, which is Document 74, and that was filed at midnight.

Counsel, I worked late yesterday afternoon and evening to make sure that I had everything ready for the sentencings, but I didn't exactly anticipate midnight filings, but with the help of my law clerk, Jennifer Johnson, I've been able to review them completely.

Any questions on that before the Court goes on?

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Not from the government.

Thank you.

MR. MONAHAN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Okay. Defense counsel -let me first then talk about the factual findings for
sentencing. Defense counsel has put forth one objection and
numerous clarifications to the presentence report in this
case. I'll ask counsel to address those objections
momentarily. First, however, I would like to address the
factual findings for sentencing.

Before the Court accepts the presentence report as part of the sentencing facts in this case and proceeds to address any additional sentencing facts the parties wish to present, I want to put on the record the Court's method for determining a sentence. This Court considers the factors

```
1
       discussed in the Advisory Sentencing Guidelines along with
 2
       other factors, such as those contained in 18 United States
 3
       Code Section 3553(a), in arriving at a sentence.
            Let me ask counsel, are any of the facts other than
 4
       those in the objections that are reported in the presentence
 5
 6
       report disputed by the government or the Defendant, Ms.
7
       Gaffney-Painter?
 8
                MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Not by the government, Your
 9
       Honor.
10
                THE COURT: Mr. Monahan?
                MR. MONAHAN: No, Your Honor.
11
12
                THE COURT: Okay. Since you're seated at counsel
13
       table, you can remain seated, if you would like, even when
14
       you address the Court. It's up to you. If you feel you
15
       have to stand, that's fine, but, otherwise, please feel
16
       comfortable to stay seated.
17
            Mr. Monahan -- let's see. Mr. Monahan, did I ask you
18
       about additional sentencing facts?
19
                MR. MONAHAN: You did, Your Honor, and I do not
20
       have any.
                THE COURT: Okay. All right. And, Ms.
21
22
       Gaffney-Painter, did I ask you about those as well?
23
                MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: You did, Your Honor.
24
                THE COURT: Okay. All right. Then, there being no
25
       objections other than those previously mentioned to the
```

factual statements contained in the presentence report, the Court adopts those statements as its finding of fact. The Defendant has entered a valid plea to Count 1 of the indictment. Accordingly, the Defendant is adjudged guilty in Case No. 1:21-CR-85 of attempted hate crime. Pursuant to 18 United States Code Section 3553(a) and C, the Court makes the following findings of relevant facts significant to the imposition of sentence.

The Defendant is guilty of violating 18 United States

Code Section 249(a)(2) and (a)(2)(A)(ii)(II), a Class A

felony, which subjects the Defendant to up to life

imprisonment, a fine of up to \$250,000, a period of

supervised release of up to 5 years, restitution, and a \$100

special assessment.

Next, I'd like to deal with the issue of objections.

The Court has already issued a written ruling on Mr. Genco's objection to the calculation of his base offense level. Are there any other objections to the presentence report that have not been previously raised?

MR. MONAHAN: No, Your Honor. Given the Court's presentence written ruling regarding our objections, which I think we, both parties, briefed adequately and preserved any issues related to, we have no additional issues to raise as far as objections.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Monahan.

Ms. Gaffney-Painter?

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: That's a correct summary, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Then, the Court notes that there are no additional objections from either the Defendant or the government as to the application of the guidelines or the facts contained in the presentence report.

Let me go over with you what the suggested federal sentencing guidelines are. Mr. Genco pled guilty to attempted hate crime in violation of Title 18 United States Code Section 249(a)(2) and (a)(2)(A)(ii). In accordance with the provisions of Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(c), the Court places on the record the following statement of reasons.

The applicable Sentencing Guidelines Manual is the 2023 edition. I know that the original presentence report used the 2021 edition, which was in effect at the time the presentence report was written, but the Court has conferred with Ms. Connerty of the probation department who was the author of that report, and the 2023 edition would not make any changes.

The guideline for a violation of 18 United States Code Section 249(a)(2) and (a)(2)(A)(ii) is Sentencing Guideline Section 2H1.1. Pursuant to Subsection (a)(1), the offense level is the level from the offense guideline applicable to

any underlying offense. Application Note 1 instructs, quote, "the offense guideline applicable to any underlying offense," unquote, means the offense guideline applicable to any other conduct established by the offense of conviction that constitutes an offense under federal, state or local law other than an offense that is itself covered under Chapter 2, Part H, Subpart 1. The offense of conviction is attempted hate crime, and the subject -- and, I'm sorry, and the subsection the Defendant pled guilty to includes an attempt to kill; therefore, the underlying offense is attempted murder. Sentencing Guideline Section 2A1.2 references assault with intent to commit murder slash attempted murder and was utilized to determine the base offense level.

Sentencing Guideline Section 2A1.2(a)(1) instructs the base offense level is 33 if the object of the offense if carried out would have constituted first degree murder.

Application Note 1 defines first degree murder as the conduct defined in 18 United States Code Section 1111, which identifies murder as the unlawful killing of a human being with malice aforethought, which is also called premeditation. As Mr. Genco planned to kill women, which included writing about the killing and planning the killing, the base offense level is 33.

Sentencing Guideline Section 3A1.1(a) instructs that a

three-level increase is appropriate if the Court at sentencing determines beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant intentionally selected any victim or any property as the object of the offense of conviction based on the actual, real or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, disability or sexual orientation. Mr. Genco initially selected women as victims of his offense; therefore, three levels are added. That makes the adjusted offense Level 36.

Pursuant to Sentencing Guideline Section 3E1.1(a) and (b), the offense level is decreased by three levels because Mr. Genco accepted responsibility for his role in the offense and entered a timely plea. The total offense level is 33.

The Court finds the defendant has zero criminal history points, which establishes a criminal history category of Roman Numeral I. Based on a total offense level of 33 and a criminal history category of Roman Numeral I, the guideline imprisonment range is 135 to 168 months, which falls in Zone D of the sentencing table. Because the guideline range of imprisonment falls within Zone D of the sentencing table, the minimum term shall be satisfied by a sentence of imprisonment. A sentence of probation is not authorized pursuant to Sentencing Guideline Section 5B1.1, Comment Note 2. The authorized term of supervised release is at least

two but not more than five years pursuant to Sentencing Guideline Section 5D1.2(a)(1). There is a \$100 special assessment which is mandatory. The guideline range for a fine is from 35,000 to \$250,000 according to Sentencing Guideline Section 5E1.2(c)(3). Restitution is not applicable.

And, Mr. Genco, I failed to say at the beginning of the hearing, if there's anything that I say that you don't understand, please know that you can take time to ask Mr. Monahan to explain it to you or ask the Court to repeat it, that would -- that's perfectly fine with the Court.

Next, then, the Court would like to address the sentencing factors under 18 United States Code

Section 3553(a). Pursuant to 18 United States Code

Section 3553(a), when imposing sentence, the Court must consider the history and characteristics of Mr. Genco, the nature and circumstances of the offense, the need to protect the public from future crime on the part of Mr. Genco, general deterrence, and the need to provide a punishment that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the goals of sentencing.

The offense conduct here is very serious. Mr. Genco pled guilty to an attempted hate crime. Hate crimes can range in severity, and this is one of the most serious ones the Court has ever had. Mr. Genco admitted in the statement

of facts to his plea agreement that his conduct included, quote, "an attempt to kill women through the use of a firearm and a dangerous weapon," unquote, and that he, quote, "formulated a plot to kill women and intended to carry it out," unquote. He admits that he was a member of a radicalized group, the incel movement, which harbors hatred and espouses violence towards women for failure to engage in sexual activity with its members.

Mr. Genco's guideline range is high here because we are looking at the underlying conduct of attempted murder. What troubles me in this case is that, in addition to his admission of an attempt to kill and intention to carry that out, Mr. Genco took some very specific and what I consider to be escalating steps to go through with this plot. The probation officer outlined this conduct in the presentence report and I'm going to highlight some of that.

And I just want to thank the probation officer on the record for doing such an excellent job on this presentence report. I know it was difficult, Ms. Connerty, and I really appreciate all of your hard work.

From January 2019 to his arrest on March 12, 2020, Mr. Genco was a member of the incel movement. He wrote about conducting a shooting suggested -- suggesting in one note that KC, or kill count, needed to be big, quote, 3,000, unquote. He wrote about obtaining military training to

further this goal and, in fact, did obtain some basic training, ultimately being discharged from the military. He also wrote about his desire to murder women in disturbing writings signing one note, quote, your hopeful friend and murderer, unquote.

He conducted concern -- he conducted concerning internet searches. Among the topics searched were for sororities and a university in Ohio. He researched gun modifications and saved illustrated guides for the construction of M-16s. He searched the internet for a variety of related topics, including planning a shooting crime, quote/unquote. Shortly before his arrest, he conducted an internet search of police scanner codes for Columbus, Ohio and university police agencies. He acquired an AR-15 rifle modified with a bump stock, loaded magazines, body armor, and boxes of ammunition. When he was arrested, these items were in the trunk of his car. Officers also located a handgun that was hidden in a vent in his bedroom.

Mr. Genco had the means and apparently the desire to follow through with this horrible plan. This is not a standard attempted hate crime. The underlying conduct here is very serious. And what I keep going back to is that, Mr. Genco, you admitted that you had a plan to kill women and you intended to carry that out. Thankfully, your plans were thwarted by the interference of law enforcement.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As to the history and characteristics of Mr. Genco, the instant offense represents Mr. Genco's first interaction with the criminal justice system. He was sentenced to a 17-month term of imprisonment out of Highland County Common Pleas Court for behaviors considered relevant conduct. Mr. Genco was raised in a chaotic and highly dysfunctional environment. He stated his mother provided adequate food, shelter, and clothing; however, she struggled with significant mental health issues which adversely impacted his childhood. He described that his mother suffered from mental illness and pain pill addiction. She was verbally abusive and controlling. Her behaviors towards Mr. Genco caused him to suffer from depression and social anxiety. Mr. Genco noted he has worked on his social anxiety in the Butler County jail and has benefitted from the services he has received.

Mr. Genco also suffers from mental health issues. The Court ordered a psychological evaluation in this case prior to sentencing, which it has reviewed along with his prior evaluation. The government argues that the recent report was incomplete and that the doctor's risk assessment scores are inaccurate. The doctor who examined Mr. Genco most recently determined that he suffers from Bipolar 1 disorder and alcohol use disorder. That doctor indicated that, if

attempt to cope, and maintains psychiatric stability, which is possible with treatment and monitoring, his risk of violence is low. Mr. Genco, I recommend that you obtain mental health counseling and alcohol abuse treatment while in custody.

In addition, I note that your lawyer asserts that you have abandoned the incel movement and no longer identify with those views; although, the government disputes this.

If you have left this radical belief system, that is a very positive development in your rehabilitation.

Mr. Genco has a history of employment; however, he could benefit from vocational training or an apprenticeship program. Mr. Genco does not have any medical needs that require treatment, except for possibly psychological drugs. He requested a dental visit for a routine cleaning and check-up.

He is not married and does not have any children. He hopes to have children in the future. Mr. Genco received a high school diploma through California and has attended some college. He plans to return to college and achieve a degree. He is 24 years old.

The need to protect the public from future crimes of Mr. Genco is high in this case given the severity of the underlying conduct. Without the involvement of law enforcement, the outcome of this case could have looked a

lot different. Here, the Court must not only deter attempted hate crimes, but also gun violence and attempted murder. Protecting the loss of innocent lives is a huge priority in this case and one the Court takes very seriously. Based on the Court's limited knowledge of mass shooting, oftentimes, we don't get the opportunity to intervene. I am incredibly grateful that the opportunity to intervene occurred here. However, the sentence reflects the severity of the underlying conduct here and the desire to protect the public from future crime.

Mr. Genco, I am taking into account that you've had some challenges in your life, including your mental health and upbringing. Given that you have suffered from a highly dysfunctional childhood and that you, yourself, suffer from serious mental health issues, the Court finds that a variance is warranted.

However, Mr. Genco, you are still looking at a significant sentence. I hope that the sentence in this case allows time such that, when you do get released, you can become a productive member of society. If you take the doctor's report at face value, Mr. Genco, if you can stay in treatment and take your mental health seriously, the doctor believes that you can be a productive member of society when you are released. We all want that for you, not just for your own health, but for the health and safety of the

community as well.

Mr. Genco's total offense level is 33 and his criminal history category is I, which results in a guideline imprisonment range of 135 months to 168 months. The parties have agreed upon a sentence in this case that Mr. Genco shall serve up to 150 months in prison. Restitution is not an issue in this case.

Any questions before I go on further?

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Not from the government. Thank you.

MR. MONAHAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. An ongoing concern to me in this case is avoiding sentencing disparities. With over 27 years on the bench, I have sentenced many defendants, and Mr. Genco's guideline range has jumped out at me as being particularly high. By applying the cross-reference to murder, Mr. Genco's guideline range jumps significantly. When I look at other similarly situated defendants who have threatened serious violence motivated by hate or other factors, their sentences have been lower, but their conduct is equally, if not more so, dangerous or reprehensible. I understand that Mr. Genco was prosecuted under the Hate Crime Act and admitted to conduct including a threat to kill women. I do not take this lightly. But when I look at similar prosecutions involving threats of violence which

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

vary factually on the way they are charged, Mr. Genco's sentencing range is disparate from those sentences.

In the case of United States versus Michael Chan, which was Case No. 1:17-CR-108, which was my case, the defendant was convicted of cyber stalking for repeatedly harassing a female victim for years with threatening text messages and packages. The harassment involved Mr. Chan anonymously calling and texting the victim for several years, sending deliveries and subscriptions to her home, and sending items to a local news media stating that a subject was driving from Canada to Cincinnati to sexually assault and murder the victim. The victim received harassing and threatening e-mails which she reported to authorities. The threat escalated when Mr. Chan sent a text message to a local detective working on the case indicating he was going to visit the victim and there was nothing law enforcement could do about it. He also indicated he was coming to Cincinnati to attack the victim on the campus of the University of Cincinnati. Mr. Chan was sentenced to 37 months imprisonment.

In the case of *United States versus Izmir Koch*, which was case 1:18-CR-34, which was also my case and actually a trial that involved Ms. Gaffney-Painter, the defendant was convicted of committing a hate crime for randomly attacking a perceived Jewish person, fracturing his face and ribs,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

threatening to slaughter, slice and kill Jewish people. The defendant requested an innocence proffer through counsel leading him to lie to federal officials resulting in a prosecution for making a false statement to federal law enforcement. The defendant was convicted of the charges at trial and sentenced to 30 months of imprisonment.

In United States versus Samuel Whitt, which was Case No. 1:17-CR-60 -- which was not my case, but Judge Michael Barrett's, my colleague -- the defendant was convicted of criminal interference with the right to fair housing. Mr. Whitt admitted in his plea agreement that he used force to intimidate and interfere with Victim A, an African American male, and Victim B, a white female, because of Victim A's race and the two victims' marital status and because the victims rented and contracted and negotiated for the rental of a home in Price Hill, Cincinnati, Ohio. did so, in part, by attempted arson. After his eviction by Victims A and B, Mr. Whitt broke into the Price Hill property and threw paint on the walls, stairs, and appliances, poured Quikrete into the drains and toilet, spray painted messages on the walls, including quote, die Nigger, unquote; quote, slum lord, unquote; and swastikas, among other things. He also attempted and threatened to cause a fire inside the house. He was sentenced to 54 months of imprisonment.

Finally, and perhaps most troubling to me, is the currently pending case of *United States versus Alex Jaques*. It's spelled J-A-C-Q-U-E-S. It is Case No. 3:22-CR-143, and it is currently pending before Judge Rice in Dayton. This case is most factually similar to Mr. Genco's case but, arguably, worse. This defendant is awaiting sentencing, and the facts in this case are disturbing with the defendant threatening violence on a mass scale against children and being in possession of significantly more weapons than Mr. Genco. The parties have entered into a Rule 11(c)(1)(A) plea agreement in which Mr. Jacques pled guilty to possession of a machine gun with a recommended advisory sentence of 30 to 37 months.

In his statement of facts, Mr. Jacques admits operating a YouTube channel entitled, quote, Guns and Film, unquote, on which he posted a number of videos about firearms. On September 30th, 2022, he posted a video entitled, quote, Torture Testing a Chromebook, paren, Washington Middle School, unquote. In the video, he shows a Google Chromebook with a Washington Middle School sticker prominently displayed on it lying on a bed in a bedroom with the camera focused on the laptop. He says, quote: Hello, guys, we are going to be torture testing a Washington Middle School Chromebook, yea, Washington Middle School Chromebook from Salinas, California, where I plan to eventually return and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

fill out my list of duties that I have filled out with names and addresses of people who have wronged me throughout the years anyways, SUHSD, which stands for the name of the That's Salinas Union High School District. stabs the laptop multiple times with a screwdriver. separate firearms are visible in the bedroom. He picks up the third firearm. He then picks up a power drill and uses the drill on the laptop. He moves to the basement and the camera shows a view of a table on which two firearms are visible. He props the laptop up on a stand in the basement and states: Yeah, okay, so Washington Middle School, you are next, and fires a single shot at the laptop, which appears -- with what appears to be a handgun. He then picks up a 9-millimeter Luger Uzi-style submachine gun and fires multiple shots in rapid succession at the laptop. He later files a -- I'm sorry, fires a rifle several times at the The school named hired armed security quards after the administration learned of Mr. Jaques' video. Mr. Jaques made other posts online, including a comment on line about quote, doing his own Parkland, unquote. enforcement searched his home, they found an arsenal of weapons and devices, including a 9-millimeter Luger Uzi-style submachine qun depicted in his video, several other firearms, ammunition, suppressors, a grenade and grenade fuses, large quantities of ammunition and qun

powder, along with other items.

Mr. Jaques faces a sentence of 30 to 37 months with the possibility of the judge imposing a greater sentence. Of course, he has not been sentenced yet, but this is quite a difference from Mr. Genco's sentencing range.

Defendants in our district who threaten violence against innocent victims, be it children or women, should be treated similarly here in this district. In fashioning Mr. Genco's sentence, I am striving to avoid these kinds of unwarranted sentencing disparities. Mr. Genco's conduct is very serious. These other defendants' conduct was very serious too.

There are not a lot of defendants that are sentenced under Sentencing Guideline Section 2H1.1 who fit the same criminal history category and offense level as Mr. Genco. I reviewed the United States Sentencing Commission's website, which is called -- which goes by the acronym JCIN, which stands for the Judiciary Sentencing Information Site -- which gives statistical information about federal defendants and the sentences received within the last five years. I know there was a criticism in the government's memo last night about the Court limiting its comparisons to local cases, so the Court went to JCIN, the United States Sentencing Commission's website, to see what national sentencings were.

When I enter 2H1.1, Criminal History Category I and Offense Level 33, there's not enough data for the site to provide statistics; that's how few comparators we have here. However, looking around at similar criminal histories, I see a trend of departures. For defendants with an offense level of 32, which is only one point below the defendant in this case, four defendants were sentenced between 2018 and 2022 and 100 percent of them received a downward departure or variance with an average length of imprisonment of 71 months and with a median length of 80 months of imprisonment.

For defendants with an offense level of 31, eight defendants were sentenced between 2018 and 2022, and 44 percent received a downward departure with an average sentence of 90 months' imprisonment and median sentence length of 93 months of imprisonment.

The Court finds that a variance is warranted in this case due to -- I'm sorry. I find that a variance is warranted in this case to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities.

Let me ask counsel, do you have any questions about the statutory provisions applicable to the imposition of punishment in this case or the suggested sentencing guidelines, Ms. Gaffney-Painter?

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Your Honor, I don't have an objection to the summary of the statutory provisions that

```
1
       apply here. But some of the Court's conclusions suggested
 2
       in its colloguy, the government would take issue with but
 3
       intends to address that in argument.
 4
                THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Monahan?
 5
                MR. MONAHAN: No, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: All right. Then, we'll now proceed to
 6
7
       the sentencing, and at this time, the Court will entertain
 8
       anything the parties wish to say in mitigation or
 9
       aggravation of sentence. Mr. Monahan.
10
                MR. MONAHAN: Yes, Your Honor. With your
11
       permission, it probably would be easier for me to be at the
12
       podium.
13
                THE COURT: Whatever you would like to do, Mr.
14
       Monahan.
15
                MR. MONAHAN: I'm going to let Mr. Genco remain
16
       seated, if that's okay.
17
                THE COURT: That's fine.
18
                MR. MONAHAN: I might want to use the visualizer.
19
       I can just slide it out? Okay. Thank you.
20
            As I know you're aware, Mr. Genco has been subjected to
21
       two prosecutions for his conduct. We're going to ask you to
22
       seriously consider how the 3553 factors deal with this kind
23
       of situation, and specifically two that I generally don't
2.4
       talk about that much, and that is promoting respect for the
25
       law, which is one of the primary considerations, and
```

providing just punishment. I know we talk a lot about punishment, but this really seems to focus us in on the word on what is "just punishment" under the statute.

We're going to submit to you today that the way this second prosecution has happened is broken. It is an example of how the system is broken when we have prosecutions by two different jurisdictions for the same thing. And I want to talk first about the state court proceedings, and I know you're aware that that happened, but I think it's important to actually really consider this as we look at the factor promoting respect for the law.

As you know, Mr. Genco committed this offense. He was arrested March 12, 2020, and that is the day he went into custody. You've heard a lot about that. That happened up in his county in Hillsboro. The local police arrested him and he was taken into custody, and he was charged with making a terroristic threat, and it relates to not just relevant conduct, but the exact identical conduct that we are still talking about today years later. He was charged with making a terroristic threat. He was appointed counsel. He was held in custody.

At the time of the charge, it was a felony of the third degree in Ohio and that case proceeded. They got discovery. They obtained his phones, his electronic devices; they did forensics on them. They built a case. The defense attorney

had him psychologically evaluated during the course of that case. I think the Court has now seen and referred to that state psych eval, and, ultimately, that case ended in a plea agreement. It took six months to get to sentencing. So between March when he was arrested of 2020 and September of 2020, that state case reached a conclusion. That's a decent amount of time for a state case, it took six months to get a resolution.

He pled guilty pursuant to a plea agreement in that case to attempted making a terroristic threat as a felony of the fourth degree. As I think we all know, that carries up to 18 months in state court, between 0 and 18 months. The judge on that case, Judge Coss -- who by the way was a trial judge who had been on the bench for over a decade at this point.

THE COURT: A child.

MR. MONAHAN: Pardon?

THE COURT: He's a child compared to me.

MR. MONAHAN: Relatively speaking, but still no inexperienced judge. He took a look at the case. He had all of the evidence before him. He heard from both sides. He had a psych report. It was a fair six-month process, and the judge gave him not even the maximum sentence that he had available. The maximum sentence would have been 18 months; that Judge gave him 17 months.

So in September of 2020, my client is sentenced after a fair state proceeding in which he pled guilty. That should have been the end of this matter. There's never been a single question or allegation there was anything unfair about that proceeding, that sufficient information wasn't provided during that proceeding, and I think societally, we expect that to be a final judgment.

And when we start thinking about promoting respect for the law, isn't this one of the things that that means? You get charged, you get counsel, you engage in negotiations and discussions about discovery, you reach a resolution, and it is done. And you know that when you are sentenced, you will do the time you are required to do, you will do your rehabilitation, and you will come back into the community a better citizen for it, hopefully. But that is not what happened in this case.

Mr. Genco goes off to prison to do his sentence, state prison now, and keep in mind this is COVID era. And I point out in our sentencing memo, this was no easy jail sentence for him. He's on lockdown. You may recall this is the height of COVID problems in jails. He does his time with the State of Ohio, and he is released February 23rd, 2021, released from prison. He goes to stay at the Alvis halfway house. He is assigned a case manager who he is working with.

He gets employment. And this is all in our sentencing memorandum. He starts at the Tumbleweed restaurant. He is a server, a busser, not what he envisioned being his life-long career, but it is work he got coming right out of prison. He worked there for a couple of months and then got himself a better job at Candle-lite in Williamsburg, Ohio, making candles. He enjoyed it. It was good work. He was making \$18 an hour at that point. He continued working at Candle-lite through the summer until July of 2021. At this point, he has been out for five months after serving his sentence, living in a halfway house, rehabilitating, working, seeing a case manager, being a productive citizen.

There has not been a single suggestion in the PSI, from the government, any police report anywhere that during this time he had finished his sentence, he was having bad behavior, bad thoughts, bad writings, nothing. He's just productive. He's done his time. He's learned his lesson, and he's on track. This is promoting respect for the law. He's out. This is providing just punishment. He's doing what he's supposed to be doing.

But what happens instead? Instead, in July of 2021, five months after my client was released from prison, the Feds charge him with this case and an indictment. He is arrested the very next day, goes into custody on July 21st of 2021. He is arrested at the Alvis House where he is

living. The government is now seeking a sentence that is nine times longer than what he received for the exact same conduct in state court. How can this conceivably under any broken sense of justice promote respect for law?

I wanted to ask why did this happen, but really the better question is: How does this promote respect for the law? How under any ill-conceived sense of justice does this promote respect for law? How is this just in a system that is supposed to be the world's best in delving out justice and punishment to defendants? It is simply not fair, Judge. It is not a fair way of proceeding in criminal prosecutions.

Now, I understand, and I'm sure the government can point out, the Supreme Court has held the double jeopardy clause does not prohibit them from doing this, we know this, but it also doesn't encourage them to do this. I mean, does the constitution encourage them to second guess state prosecutions; is that the point of federal prosecutions, second-guessing what's already been done in a fair even-handed state criminal prosecution? We submit it is not, it is not what the government should be doing with its time.

So as you consider promoting respect for the law, we simply ask that you consider these factors. On top of the state sentence, Mr. Genco has now sat in custody for another two-and-a-half -- just over two-and-a-half years. He went

into custody July of 2021 and here we are February 29th, 2024. So in addition to the state sentence he had already served, he has now served another two years, I think, and seven months, is where we are.

It appears the government's position is the state got it wrong and we need to fix it, but that certainly is not how the justice system is supposed to work. So as we look forward and I submit to you -- and I think the Court may have some feelings about this already -- but this offense Level 33 for this offense shows how these guidelines are broken for this crime, especially when you consider what these other defendants have received for similar and I think often more egregious conduct. It's broken. This is a broken guideline system, that this is where Mr. Genco ends up.

And as I'm looking at these other sentences that you mentioned -- and I explained this in the sentencing memo -- it seems to me that there's a spectrum of offenses. There are people who have actually committed a violent offense and then there are those who have threatened or attempted to commit an offense, and certainly that's two different groups of people, and that's a spectrum. You know, I'm a guy who thought about it, I'm a guy who planned it, I'm a guy who attempted to do it; and I'm a guy who did it. Okay. This is a spectrum of conduct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My guy has pled guilty, and nothing I said today will take away from the fact that this man, from day one, all he has wanted to do is plead guilty to this crime. And we get caught up legally what is an attempt and what is not an attempt and this has been from an attorney perspective a tricky case to put one's thumb on; but, nonetheless, he has always wanted to accept his responsibility, and that's what he has done and that's what he is doing fully today, accepting responsibility for where he was.

But I want to say this, when we look at these other cases that you mentioned and the Court already summarized, I'm going to hit a couple high points. I was going to do a more thorough summary, but you really hit what I was going If we look at two defendants which you mentioned, first the Koch, K-O-C-H, case, which you had, here's a defendant that committed a violent offense, this is a person that actually did it. And I was actually reading the government's sentencing memorandum in that case that he comes out of a restaurant and is yelling how he hates Jewish people and wants to slaughter them, those are his words. demands to know who present is a Jewish person, and he encounters who you know is the victim -- I know you heard that trial -- punches him twice in the back of head. guy falls to the ground. The defendant and his friends continue to assault, kick, and punch this victim laying in

the parking lot. His fiancee attempts to intervene. The men who are beating her husband threw her to ground like a rag doll, is what the government wrote, while she screamed. It was only a friend of the victim who was able to intervene and stop that defendant from beating this man, who knows how badly, I mean, it was stopped, but what if the friend hadn't intervened, he might have beat the guy to death, for all we know. Does it get more serious than that? He wasn't done, though, with the beating, because then he proceeded to run around the parking lot screaming: If I had a knife, I would cut a Jew. So, you know, here we have a guy that went all the way and beat someone, perhaps what would have been significantly worse if not stopped, and as you pointed out, that guy got 30 months, 30 months in jail. My client has already served more than 30 months in jail.

One case we didn't mention because I know it wasn't in my sentencing memorandum, but Mr. Johnson, who pled guilty before you yesterday, I know you're very familiar with it, I'm just going to mention it. Mr. Johnson beat an Asian person at University of Cincinnati, a student who was simply walking down the street. He beat him yelling out racial slurs. He also was pulled off of that victim by other students in the area. We don't know how bad that would have gotten had they not done that. Mr. Johnson has an agreed sentence of not more than 22 months.

So those are two cases where actual violence was committed, which again is not Mr. Genco. We have Mr. Whitt, which you mentioned, I think Mr. Whitt is an interesting case, and he's a defendant who put racial slurs all over the African American man's apartment home. This defendant — and I think you pointed out all of the facts — I wanted to remind you is more than just an attempt at arson. This defendant went in, put the gas on the stove, lit a candle next to it and ripped out the smoke alarm. I think it sounds like it was just happenstance that that didn't kill people. It certainly sounds like it was the intention, that in addition to the knife that the defendant stuck in the floor of that apartment.

And that was a civil rights violation case by force and threat of force, attempted to, and did, willfully injure, intimidate, and interfere with Victim A and Victim B. That was what the charge said. He pled guilty to the civil rights violation, got 54 months in prison, \$66,000 in restitution that defendant caused. And I think you pointed out all of the other inflammatory stuff about him, although, I would point out he also had a prior conviction for racial intimidation, painting swastikas and things on churches and schools.

So again, when we're comparing these cases -- and I know the government has attempted to minimize the

seriousness of them, they certainly didn't at the time that they were prosecuting these people, and that's some of what we're pointing out today and in our memorandum. At the time, these were Public Enemy No. 1. Mr. Whitt got the longest sentence of anyone at 54 months, which I think you've already pointed out.

The threat cases, Mr. Chan, I know you handled that case, that was 37 months, and you did a very thorough job of summarizing everything he did. I would remind you he also threatened shootings at UC and bombing at the university, so it wasn't just threatening that woman. He threatened broader attacks. He also harassed the police at one point, even ordering pizza to the police department because he just continued to taunt them that they could never catch him over the course of six years. 37 months.

Mr. Jacques I think you've covered very thoroughly.

And I submitted a memorandum last night detailing the government's sentencing memorandum in that case, which is actually hard to read because there's so much violence and there's actually sex offense allegations against I believe his sister and it goes on and on. So as you pointed out, the government agreed to a guideline range in that case of 30 to 37 months. I submitted you the entire sentencing memorandum the government submitted in that case. There was no request for an upward departure or variance.

Finally, the last case I want to mention is the Ferguson case. This was a Sixth Circuit decision on attempted kidnapping. And I did spend a good deal of time talking about this case related to Mr. Genco's case in our sentencing memorandum, so I won't rehash everything we've said in that case. But in Ferguson, the defendant in that case, I would submit to you, was really further down the line toward committing a crime than Mr. Genco. That defendant went to trial. And this -- just for the record, I know I've cited it, it's United States versus Ferguson, 65 Fed 4th 806, a published decision from the Sixth Circuit, April 20th, 2023.

Mr. Ferguson was planning a kidnapping. He had a firearm, an AR-15 rifle. He had created an online group, you know, those state militia people who are very violent. They had created a name for themselves. They had created an online group. His plan was to lure law enforcement officials to a remote location under a ruse of having a female pretend to be in a domestic violence situation, kidnap them, strip them, take their weapons for their own use and send them on their way as kind of a calling card to law enforcement as to how bad these people were. This is a plan in the kidnapping. They got as far as actually going out to a remote house and doing a practice call to see how quickly law enforcement would show up for their future

planning of this offense. That defendant -- however, there was an undercover FBI agent working in his group of people and they arrested him that day and charged him with attempted kidnapping. So the importance of all of this is look how far down the line this guy got, he actually phoned law enforcement to test how quickly they would come to a location for the kidnapping.

Importantly, the Sixth Circuit holds in a published decision -- and this is after our proceedings were already -- we've already pled and already awaiting sentencing. They hold that that was not even an attempt under federal law, not even an attempt. And they focus on a couple of things I want to just read you directly from the Sixth Circuit decision. Preliminary or planning activities are not -- and this is this case at page 812 in the decision. The Sixth Circuit, preliminary or planning activities are not sufficient to constitute an attempt. A fragment of the crime must essentially be in progress. The purpose of the substantial step requirement is to ensure against the danger of convicting for mere thoughts, desires or motives.

The Sixth Circuit says: Ferguson's plan was to conduct this raid on a law enforcement officer more than a month in the future. The government pointed us to no Sixth Circuit case in which an attempt conviction was predicated on a plan

as far in the future as Ferguson here. I struggle to find out that's different than our case, I really do.

Now, my client pled guilty and is admitting guilty to committing an attempt. But when you consider the degrees of seriousness of crimes — this is what I'm wanting you to look at — is we have again people with plans, people who attempt, people who commit violent crimes. Where is he on the spectrum, how far along the line is he? The Sixth Circuit says: The possibility of committing this crime more than a month in the future. The government has not shown us a single case where that constitutes an attempt. We know what attempts are. I've got a gun, I'm on my way to the bank, the police arrest me before I get there. I'm in the park, I'm going to snatch a woman's purse, and I get thwarted before I run away from them. These are what we understand as attempts under the law.

I think Ferguson really helps us focus on how serious of an attempt was Mr. Genco's conduct. Now, it was serious and he is having some dark thoughts, and certainly he did a lot of writings that were very dark and violent and serious. However, one of the things the Sixth Circuit noted in Ferguson — and this is the last thing I want to point out — the defendant in that case, the government admitted it did not know when Ferguson acquired his gear, and the record demonstrates unequivocally that he had, at minimum,

owned his AR rifle prior to espousing his idea on

April 28th. So the Sixth Circuit is focussing on the fact
that he didn't buy the gun as part of the plan, he already
had a gun. That is exactly what we have here.

Okay. If you go back to the government's filing, sentencing memorandum, it indicated that he obtained all of his gear January and February or in May, and his first insult post is July. Okay. So again, this is not purchasing a gun in relation to sub beliefs. It's guns that he already had and then he gets into these sub beliefs — and they indicate in the filings and indictments — in July of 2019, that's how far back this was.

So in considering Ferguson in total, which we think is a very important comparison, we ask the Court to keep that in mind in deciding just how far down the line and how serious this conduct was in relation to being an attempt.

Okay. All right. There's one other point I want to touch on related to -- and to be clear, the government indicated my client bought the tactile gloves, bulletproof vest, hoodie, cargo pants, Bowie knife, and skull face mask in January of 2019; the armory, the long rifle gun in February; and the rest of the gear, Glock, magazines, clip, holster, in May. And then his first insult communication is in July.

I want to mention one other point about the seriousness

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the conduct and that is the surveillance. The government indicated in the indictment that my client conducted surveillance at an Ohio university on January 15th, and this is something they've kind of pointed to as to why this was an attempt and why this is escalating. Specifically, the government wrote on -- this is their government response in opposition to our motion to dismiss, which was Document No. 35. They wrote: Genco also conducted surveillance in the location of a university in Ohio. IP records from his e-mail account show him logging into an IP address on the same day that he drafted a note that appears to detail his surveillance of a school. An FBI tool showed the IP address came back to Alliance Ohio, and I know you heard this in pretrial filings. They believe or they've indicated in writing in a filing that my client was surveilling a university in Alliance, Ohio. The government further wrote: A location over three hours away from his home in Hamilton County, Ohio, where he was later arrested and his weaponry and to-do list were discovered.

I'm going to tell you we don't believe there's any evidence to support that that happened, that he went to Alliance, Ohio, that he conducted surveillance at that Mountain Union university. We challenge the government to show you evidence that that's what my client did, that he went to Alliance, Ohio and surveyed Mount Union university.

And we ask you, failing that, the standard is preponderance of the evidence, which we've not seen it. We don't believe that you should be considering the surveillance at Mount Union university.

All right. Final thing I want to talk about this morning --

THE COURT: Take your time, Mr. Monahan.

MR. MONAHAN: Yes, thank you. -- is my client, you know -- and I know I've saved this to the end, but it probably is some of the most important part of what you've got to consider and think about in deciding how big of a variance he deserves. And I want to talk about his history and I want to talk about his rehabilitation, and I want to mention the psychological evaluation that the Court has already referenced.

As you know, Mr. Genco had, I think it's fair to say, a strange childhood. As you know from the psychologist and from the state psych report, he definitely had a severe mental illness. The latest doctor has termed that bipolar disorder, which is one of the big four of the serious mental health problems. He grows up with a mother who by her own admission in her letter had mental health problems. I think she's opined to you that she believes her mental illness, her father of Mr. Genco leaving their lives, and her being left to raise him by herself, that that did not go very

smoothly. His mother described herself as autistic, agoraphobic, and suffers from severe PTSD due to horrific abuse and homelessness that she suffered as a child. She collects Social Security Disability for her disabilities.

She raised him and she indicated -- and I think the PSI supports -- that he was severely bullied as a child in school, and the mother takes him out of school and homeschools, which can work for some parents and kids, but it does not sound like this was an ideal situation. What he actually ended up facing was complete social isolation during his formative years. He is severely stunted in his social skills. He had odd things they did, like having a goat rescue farm, which my client enjoyed doing as a child, but that was his, you know, contact with his mother and with goats that they're raising on the farm. His mother indicated he was always kind to the animals. He enjoyed caring for them.

The one kind of work it appears his mother was able to do was she had kind of a cleaning company that she ran herself, and she was working on military installations just doing cleaning. That's indicated in her letter, and I talked about this in the memo. And my client would go with her as a young person there when she was doing the cleaning and as a result got to interact with some of the military personnel, which actually was something that he developed a

dream early of possibly being a military person when he was a young person and something he wanted to do when he got older. So these things are put into his head at this age.

Finally graduates homeschool and this is all out in California. He does a year of online college at Shasta College in California. Again, no social interaction when you're having online school. When he was 18, his maternal grandmother passed away, and he and his mom receive an inheritance, and that's what brings them to Ohio.

His mother makes the decision to move here to

Hillsboro, Ohio in 2018. They have no family here. They

know nothing of this community. But his mother wanted to

get away from California, find a lower cost of living, find

a safer place to live than California, and they move to

Hillsboro, Ohio. So Tres, already who suffered from severe

isolation, comes somewhere where he knows no one at age 18

and just has again his mother.

He had a very difficult time adjusting to the move. As I mentioned, he has no friends here. It just further fosters his isolation and social awkwardness. So in 2019, this is when he turns 19 years old, so -- and I want to remind you, and I should be repeatedly reminding you of this, this stuff, this incel sub belief and guns and all of this stuff, he is a 19-year-old boy at this point, 19 years old. We are now, what, four years later in 2024, he's a

very different person sitting before you than a 19-year old kid who came from that background of complete social isolation.

You know, and this is a problem with this generation to start, living their lives online, you know, phones and computers, and then you take someone who has been completely socially isolated and taken out of school and that's his existence, is online. So when you see these troubling posts and internet searches, and, I mean, yes, they're -- for us to look at this from the outside, it's certainly concerning, but, you know, you take a human being's thoughts 24/7 and the things they think about and the things they write down, especially when they think they're in this harmless world of the internet, I think it's just a perspective that we have to have.

You know, the government is pointing to the three things he wrote, the one-page note he wrote in Greece and then this document he writes about "your helpful friend and murderer." You know, this is stuff he's writing. He's not sending it to anyone. He's not threatening anyone with it. These are things he wrote one day in Greece. He's drunk most of the trip, we've learned that now. So it's hard to judge someone's entire existence and their entire what they planned to do based on a couple of isolated things they wrote over a long period of time, especially when this whole

anonymous internet is his existence. You know, that's where he lived his life, and he said, you know, he's expressing these dark views, just getting them out. He's not fond of the fact that he's having them, but this is where he was and that's why he's pled guilty. This is why he pled guilty in state court and why he wanted to plead guilty here. He's admitting his part. It's just how much punishment does one deserve for this?

So we're here in Ohio, he's now turned 19 years old, he's having these dark thoughts. We know that his grandmother passed away. He's able to take some of that inheritance money and he takes this fated trip to Greece. It's the first time he's really been away from his mother in his life. Greece has an 18-year-old drinking age at that time and he gets there and, oh, boy, he lays into the alcohol heavy. He writes the one-page note that we later find -- the police later find at his house buried in a tub. It's one page and it's the rambling thoughts he wrote down while in Greece, which got retained and was found by his mother later and then found by the police.

After he gets back from this trip, he's joining the military, and I mention this was an idea planted in his head at a young age, you know, that he thought he would join the military. And he goes in and he actually -- contrary to what the government is suggesting -- hoped that the military

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would kind of straighten him out, get him off of some of these dark thoughts, get him into something that's a team and something that he can believe in and learn from, and it was the absolute opposite experience. He's just like he was at school, he's bullied. He gets deathly ill with pneumonia which causes him not to be able to keep up, and it's just a traumatic event for him. And he also realizes I don't want to be carrying a gun around and shooting people in the military, that was not something that appealed to him when the thought of carrying a gun and shooting people hit him. That's not to say that he still doesn't have dark thoughts, but this was an experience that really kind of opened his eyes, and he gets out of the military. And we know now that he has got undiagnosed bipolar disorder through all of this. And he tries things like St. John's Wort, which was in the file, and that actually may have been exacerbating his state and contributing to his racing thoughts.

And during this time -- and I'm not going to hash all of these out. I attached them to the sentencing memorandum. I know the government is going to show you some searches he did. But I also showed you some posts that he did where he's having reservations about the incel movement. Those are attached as exhibits to our memorandum. Back in August, he wrote in a message team with a friend complaining about how incels were prone to violence, he no longer wanted to be

involved with incels.

When we get around to January and he's back out of the military, he's writing a friend that he deleted his Discord app because he's developed as an individual and no longer in incel, that was January of 2020, two months before his arrest. He's writing to a professor in Georgia who's doing an article on incels identifying that Mr. Genco used to be an incel, and he has developed, is no longer an incel.

So these are intermixed with some of the things the government is pointing you to as to what he's doing. So I'm not saying he didn't have dark thoughts and I'm not saying he continued -- didn't continue to have dark thoughts, but it's not always clear. This is not a person who knows what he's doing and is focused on what he's doing. This is a person who's all over the place on what he should be doing and what he should be believing, and he clearly needs help, and he tries to get help.

You can see in the presentence report he goes to his doctor, which is Adena healthcare. They put him on a couple of different medications to try to help him. But he's seeing a family practice doctor in a small town who I'm estimating was not putting his thumb on the depth of Mr. Genco's psychological problems, but he did try to get help.

Then, we come around to March and he's having arguments with his mother and he's playing these violent video games

in his room, and he has these firearms that we know he acquired a year before. And the police show up and it's kind of a domestic incident, and he gets arrested. And this is where the police discover this one-page letter that he wrote in Greece in August of 2019. What is that, seven months earlier, eight months earlier at that point. And, of course, now this letter is a big deal because it does -- reading it, I'm not going to say it doesn't -- it sounds like someone who's having this these kind of dark thoughts about a shooting, but he wrote it eight months ago, and now it's fresh to them because they just found it. So he is then arrested, and I think you now know the back end of the story. We know that he stays in custody and everything that happens to him in the state court proceedings.

So we look at Mr. Genco as a whole person when we get around to sentencing and not only what did he do, but where is he now, what has happened with him since then. He started his rehabilitation in state prison. He was out for five months, I've already talked fairly extensively about that, and then he goes back into federal custody and has now sat there for two-and-a-half years.

You know that, you know, he's at the Butler County jail this whole time. There's only so much one can do at the Butler County jail to try to better themselves. That's an unfortunate part of, you know, this existence, but he's two

years and seven months at Butler County now. I think if you look at, you know, this veterans program he's been involved in -- you notice every time he shows up, he's in a khaki shirt and pants, which is not inmate garb. He's in this MANA program which gives him a lot of freedom moving around the jail. He is a porter and does a lot around the jail, laundry and those types of things. He's in this MANA program. I sent a letter to you from the gentleman who runs that program, sterling report of my client. It's hard -- I wish we could have had him in treatment the last two-and-a-half years, but that's not an option at the Butler County jail.

But what we suggest you should see is this -- and really it's interesting to compare him to that defendant in Jacques. I submitted to you the series of letters and communications that Jaques did out of that Butler County jail, it's in the memo I filed late last night, letter after letter threatening people and continuing his interest in guns. I mean, there's an evidence situation, perhaps, that's very different than my client in terms of what is his focus since he's been locked up. This is a different person than he was in March of 2020 when he was arrested, which at this point is, if I'm counting, that's almost four years ago. I challenge the government or the Court to find a single complaint about him since he was arrested in March of

2020, one bad incident of conduct, one bad thought, one bad thing he wrote, one bad thing he said to another person, anything that demonstrates he's still harboring these beliefs.

In fact, look at the letters, and I know we submitted to you a bunch of letters from inmates -- and the government might say inmates, what do you expect -- but these people, do you see this very much? People say how nice he is, how caring he is, how he's helping look after those that come into the jail.

I want to point out I've got a mother and father here in the second row, and I don't want to single them out too much, but they're here because their son was locked up with my client and I submitted letters to you earlier this week -- I won't say their names in public, I don't think we need to -- but you got their letters and now they're here because they were so compelled by how my client helped their son while he was locked up at that jail. I mean, who does this, who is this compelled by the kindness of an inmate to travel all the way to Cincinnati for this sentencing because they support him and what he did for their son while his son was -- while their son was at the jail?

I mean, that's just one tidbit of who is this person at his core and what is he becoming and why we can feel confident he is never ever going to do this again, and that

he has learned his lesson. He learned his lesson when he was prosecuted the first time, and you can darn well bet that he learned it when he is prosecuted for the same thing the second time. He is done with the beliefs.

The psychologist sees it. And I know, you know, as with everything else in the case, the government takes issue with the psychologist as well and says he doesn't know what he's doing and he didn't do the right testing, how could he possibly know this guy from meeting him one time. I would inform them that most psychologists go meet the defendant at the jail one time and they do a report and they interview family and this is how the process works. You know, we have the state psychological evaluation which said he has a severe mental illness.

We then have the doctor that -- actually, the Court wanted another psychological evaluation; we got that done. This doctor, he's an attorney and a psychologist, he comes in and gives a very long, detailed, fair assessment of my client. And this is while, you know, right here at the end of the process after he's been at the Butler County jail all this time, and he got the evidence, he got the indictment, he got the PSI. He's able to see everything the government is seeing in this defendant, and this is what he says, he says, yeah, these were bad things and, yeah, he's got a severe mental illness, and this is, you know, maybe a bad

concoction. But looking at this Defendant and where he is at this point in his life, he is, what, a low risk of future harm if, as you pointed out, he'll deal with his mental health and he'll deal with his what I think is an alcohol problem.

That's compelling, right? I mean, that's compelling information. If our goal -- you know, and we understand the Court's concern, if I cut Mr. Genco a break, is he going to turn around and be right back in the same spot. You know what, I don't know how much better evidence you could have that he's not. I don't know how much better evidence you can have that he is not.

I think the bottom line at the end of this case is really we're sitting here in the middle of an unnecessary prosecution. He's already duly prosecuted for this same crime. He got a sentence that was frankly in line with the defendants that we've had got. He got 17 months, that's not out of line with what defendants are getting. But, go ahead, fine, add now he's sat in the Butler County jail for two-and-a-half years. He's already in the range of the highest sentence we could find for an offense of this ilk.

Now, I know it's a big stretch to ask for time served, and I get it, and I hear the Court saying we want you to do some more time. And we want you to consider this. We really appreciate the Court for looking at some of the

national statistics which are not out of line with where we are today and certainly the local statistics support. We think the psych report supports that. We think his behavior over the last two-and-a-half years support that. We think the letters he received, the sentence he got in state court, every single thing lines up to say this is enough.

And the government wants to complain about the cases we've given you and complain about the psych report. Well, they've not cited you any other cases to look at, okay? And he's been sitting in custody for two-and-a-half years. If they have a problem with the psych report, they can ask for one to be done at the BOP, which they've not done one time in two-and-a-half years. Okay. So it's easy to sit back and arm chair quarterback, oh, this is wrong, that's wrong, we don't agree with that. You know what, take the steps to get the information you think the Court needs, because they haven't done it.

So in sum, Your Honor, we ask you to consider a sentence of time served in this case. Enough is enough. Failing that, failing that, if the Court deems that not appropriate, certainly, we've given you plenty of information of similar defendants in similar cases to fashion an appropriate sentence. With all of that in mind, we ask the Court, as you've indicated, to downward vary to a sentence of time served or whatever sentence the Court deems

1 Thank you. appropriate. 2 THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Monahan. 3 Ms. Gaffney-Painter. 4 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Thank you, Your Honor. May I 5 approach the podium? THE COURT: Sure, please do. 6 7 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: And, Mr. Miller, I would like 8 to use the overhead projector, please. 9 THE DEPUTY: Okay. 10 THE COURT: Let me take this minute to thank the 11 couple who are here who came to support the Defendant. 12 That's extremely nice of you and it says a lot to the Court. 13 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: May I proceed? 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Your Honor, earlier in this 16 proceeding, you gave a summary of all of the documents that 17 have been filed in advance of this sentencing. Even as of 18 midnight last night, the second supplemental sentencing 19 memorandum was filed in this case. And I don't wish to 20 belabor those documents, because I know the Court has read 21 them and considered them thoughtfully, but some of the 22 arguments made by defense counsel both here and in those 23 submissions I would like to respond to. 2.4 First, let's talk about the Jacques case out of Dayton. 25 Now, we highlighted in our submission to you how that case

is distinguishable from the case we have here. And in his response, defense counsel asserted certain things about that case that are just simply not correct. So, first, in the government's sentencing submission, page 2 and page 20, the prosecutors there are advocating for a significant sentence of imprisonment, and having spoken to those prosecutors, they fully intend to seek an upward variance in that case. They are not bound to make a specific request in their sentencing memorandum. He asserted that under the law they would be required to do that, that's simply not true, and they have been advocating for a significant sentence in that case.

And some of the relevant conduct that is referenced in the government's submission and was argued here by defense counsel I think would come as a surprise to Mr. Jaques' defense counsel, who is also a federal public defender. They are contesting vehemently a lot of that relevant conduct, including the accusation of sexual assault in the family and the accusation that there was a list. The government never found a list. There was no list found in the search warrant for that case. Mr. Jaques on his YouTube channel said I have a list of people that I want to, you know, get back at, but that list has never been located. And, in fact, defense counsel, the federal public defender's office, is saying there was no list, it was merely a joke.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In that case, they had threats, very dire, scary threats, a lot of very scary weapons, but what they did not have was a plot. They did not have a plan. They had someone shooting a laptop with a middle school sticker on it saying that he was going to -- you know, wanted to target that middle school. But that middle school is located in California and the defendant is in Dayton, Ohio, and they found no evidence that the defendant was planning a trip to California, that he had taken any substantial step towards completing what he was talking about on the YouTube channel. Instead, he was making threats and engaging in a lot of scary behavior, but they didn't have an attempt. If they had an attempt, if they had the substantial step, they could have charged it, they would have done something different. What they could charge was possession of a machine gun and so that's what they charged here.

THE COURT: Somebody must have taken his threats seriously, because the school board hired private help to protect the school, so I think somebody believed his threat.

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Oh, absolutely, and that was a prudent decision on behalf of the school, to take this YouTube video seriously, but what the school views as its personal responsibility to the security of its students is very different as to whether you can make out the elements of an attempted murder charge here. There was absolutely no

plan as far as they were aware, that there was no list, there was no planned day. Now, compare that to this case where there is a written plan, a written to-do list that the defendant prepared with a date certain, with a target, with an outline for what he intended to do in the future.

Your Honor, this here is Government Exhibit D to our sentencing memorandum. So let's take a look at this.

Defense counsel wrote in the sentencing submission and argued here today that these are just, you know, the drunken ramblings of Mr. Genco when he's traveling to Greece. But that Greek trip -- he brought this letter home with him, he kept it in his room, and even after his mother found it and confronted him with it, he still kept it. And why? Because he was working his way through this list.

Now, there was a lot of reference in the argument and in the sentencing submission to the state charges in this case. And I want to be clear, the defense counsel said, you know, it's duplications and that he was fully, completely, and fairly prosecuted by the state. Again, I think that would come as a surprise to Mr. Genco's state defense attorney who filed a motion to dismiss because he said that writing a private note in your bedroom is not a threat. A threat has to be communicated. It can't be a terroristic threat if it's just a document.

And after he lost that motion to dismiss, Mr. Genco

entered an Alford plea. I thought that the defense attorney would consider that a fair prosecution. And in the state, this is what they had, this is what they had. They didn't have the breadth of evidence that we have. They didn't have — there was so much evidence that the federal investigation uncovered that they did not have when they charged this. The best they could do was making a terroristic threat, and even Mr. Genco's defense counsel thought that that was a stretch because it had never been communicated. Mr. Monahan referenced, you know, the Defendant's postings, this was never posted, this was private.

(Indicating.) This was in his room and this was his to-do list that he was following. He brought it back from his trip and he worked through it for months. So let's look at the first entry on this list here. The C4H8Cl2S, law enforcement believes that's the chemical composition of mustard gas. Not only does he have this mustard gas written on this list, he does web searches for mustard gas in August of 2019, and he wrote a note to himself on his phone that one of his creation tasks was mustard gas.

Let's look at this next entry on this list, right across, "OSU," believed to be a reference to Ohio State University. The day before his arrest, he saved a screen shot to his phone of a web search he had done of police

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

scanner codes for the Franklin County Police Department that would respond to any sort of attack at Ohio State. He also accessed Facebook pages for various Ohio State sororities. This is not just a writing, a drunken rambling. This is his to-do list. This is his guidepost.

(Indicating.) Now, look here, "M-16 is optimal, convert per mil spec." So not only did he write that down, but he researched online how to convert guns, and he in that note -- the creation notes that he made to himself where he mentioned mustard gas, he also mentioned making a "homemade full auto," which we believe is a reference to making a fully automatic weapon, which is what an M-16 would be, and M-16 optimal but he can't get it, so he's going to get a mil spec and convert it, like he said in his to-do list. He did it, he converted his AK-47 to an automatic through the attachment of a bump stock. And he took the gun that was found in his room and he removed the rear rails and made that an automatic weapon as well, that's a machine gun. That is all after he joined the incel movement in at least July of 2019. He admits to joining in July of 2019, and after that point, whenever he purchased the guns, he researched how to modify them and he modified them.

Let's look at the list here. "Will get arms training in BCT Georgia." Now, contrary to what defense just represented, it doesn't say: I'm going to join the military

because I want to be a part of a team, because I want to learn how to control my dark thoughts. He wants arms training, that's why he's going there, and, in fact, he did exactly what was on his to-do list. He entered Army basic training in Fort Benton, Georgia in between August of 2019 and December of 2019. While he's there, he's not looking up how to be a better teammate, he's not looking up how to control my dark thoughts. He's reading articles about mass shootings.

After the part about the kill count where he's intending to kill 3,000 people, question mark, he says:
"Need to write plot, take some writing classes," question mark. Well, we know that he followed through with that. We know that he wrote his manifesto in accordance with his to-do list. That's Government Exhibit E to the sentencing submission. This is not just a note. This is not just drunken ramblings. This is his outline of steps that he needs to take in order to accomplish his objective, the objective that he admitted to in this court when he pleaded guilty formulating a plot to kill women and intending to carry it out.

And when we are talking about Federalism or debating the merits of whether a state can bring a case or the Feds can bring a case, we are distracting ourselves from the facts of this case. We are losing sight of what he admitted

to here and what the offense is that we're looking at. This is not a threat case. This is more than a threat. This is an attempt. He took substantial steps, the Court has already found this. He had a plot. He wasn't just saying he was going to do it, he was doing it. And as you said earlier in this proceeding, but for law enforcement, he would have carried it out by his own admission.

I want to talk about the comparable cases in addition to Jaques. You mentioned the Chan case, the cyber stalking case, and I would point out that, No. 1, cyber stalking obviously is a different statute than what we're dealing with here, but also it sounds like there was a single victim in that case who was absolutely terrorized, but what we're talking about here is a mass murder of potentially ideally, according to his to-do list, in the thousands. I mean, he had modified his weapons to be efficient killing machines. We are looking at a potential victim pool that is much larger than a single victim.

In terms of *United States versus Koch*, I prosecuted that case, as you mentioned, and I would note that we requested the cross-reference and the application to the guidelines. We felt that that was just a brutal assault and we should have cross-referenced away from the civil rights guidelines in the applicable underlying offense. Your Honor chose not to do the cross-reference at that time, and so the

guidelines range for the hate crime was much lower than it would have been had the assault been cross-referenced in that case. And as for his sentence of 30 months, the government advocated for a much higher than that, and I will note for the record that he never served that sentence. He fled the country after he was allowed to self-report, so he still never served that sentence.

THE COURT: The Court is aware of that. That's the only fugitive I have from a trial, but Judge Barrett has Dr. Durrani, which I think is probably even more significant.

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Also, the United States

versus Whitt case, I prosecuted that case as well before

Mr. Barrett -- or excuse me, Judge Barrett, and he did

receive a sentence of 54 months. We asked for more than

that when we sought his sentence. But I will note that Mr.

Monahan represented that the attempted arson in that case

would have had a high likelihood of killing someone. The

home where Mr. Whitt turned on the gas and put the candle

and ripped out the smoke detector was empty at the time. It

was not occupied by anyone. There was no -- of course, had

that fire caught, it would have caused extensive damage, but

there was no evidence in that case that anyone lived there.

So it is not on par with what we're talking about here, which is actually murdering someone. It seems that

Mr. Whitt's intention was to cause the destruction and fear that he caused, but not necessarily to kill anyone. And I assure you that, if we had evidence that he was trying to kill someone, we would have charged that.

He pointed Your Honor to the *United States versus*Ferguson case in the Sixth Circuit. I don't believe it's worth much of the Court's time to have a legal argument about whether this is attempt or not. He's already pleaded guilty to it. But I will direct you to a page in that case, this is on both 814 and 815, the Sixth Circuit found it relevant that Ferguson had no timeline for his plan, let alone an intent to execute it imminently. As you know from the to-do list, he had a date in mind. There's the date certain, May 23rd, 2020. He's got a countdown, 290 days. His web searches also show that he was counting down how many days, how many days until May 23rd.

They also note in the Ferguson case that Ferguson never provided a date or timeline for his plan. He had no location, no date or deadline, and not even a consistently expressed goal regarding how he intended to carry it out. Well, that's not this case. We have a location, we have a date, we have a plan, and we have steps, multiple substantial steps taken towards executing that plan.

There is no comparable case here. This is the first hate crime prosecution of an incel in the entire United

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

States. The reason you could find no national comparison is because there isn't one, this is the first. And an intelligence analyst who researches extremists spoke to a Cleveland newspaper recently and said that this, quote, "would be a landmark case in gender-based violence, this is the first."

And it's very important here for all of the reasons that have already been articulated, but for some that are not, to send a deterrence message to members of the incel community about this hateful ideology and, should they take steps to follow through with that ideology, that the government will take it seriously. And we know, we know that the incels are looking at this case. And how do we know, because Your Honor received a letter on September 1st, 2021, from a group of interveners who called themselves self-identified incels, and in their letter, they said, quote, "we respectfully seek permission to intervene and ask that the Court unseal and grant public access to two exhibits." And later in the letter, they said, quote: the undersigned, are individual members of the public who self-identify as members of the involuntary celibate incel community. The prosecution of the defendant is of great interest to us and to the general public."

The unusual nature of the Defendant's alleged activities and alleged affiliation with the incel community

have made national and international news. This case is one of the most prominent to date allegedly involving the incel community. There is a need for general deterrence. This sentence needs to provide general deterrence, and we have a basis to conclude that the incels are watching, would pay attention, and that it could have a deterrent effect.

But we not only need general deterrence, we need specific deterrence here. Mr. Genco filed a letter with the Court, eight pages to the Court. Nowhere in that letter does he renounce his incel beliefs. He doesn't even use the word "incel." In fact, the words he does use are quite telling. On page 3, he quote: "At this time I came across the community that would be my undoing and I wish never came across. When you're so low, you become vulnerable to the allure of misery and want more than anything understanding." Note that this is his description of the incel community. It's a community, first of all, and also "understanding," he felt he got understanding from these people and their toxic ideology.

And there is no evidence anywhere in this record from the psychologist's reports, from the defense counsel, that Mr. Genco has been deradicalized. He was immersed in this philosophy. He espoused it. He believed it. He planned an active mass murder in furtherance of it, and nothing in these reports or the submissions engages with this concept

in any way. You can't just decide when you're this immersed in this toxic-ness to just step away from it. You need serious intervention, you need deradicalization, and we can't even have him engaging with the word, engaging with the facts, engaging with the community that he was a part of it.

This is not a threat case. This is a case where we need to engage with the actual facts, with the actual group he was a part of, with the actual philosophy that they espouse. We can't look away from it. And calling this a threat case or comparing it to other threat cases really minimizes the conduct here.

In his argument, Mr. Monahan said there's basically two categories of offenses, those that are done and those that are attempted and threatened. I disagree. Those are three categories. Attempt is its own category. It should not be lumped in with threats. It is further down the road, involves substantial steps, involves more commitment to the threat. It is not just about the subjective experience of those that receive those words, but it's about actually taking steps.

When we are looking to compare this case, instead of comparing this case to other civil rights offenses, we should consider comparing this case to domestic terrorism cases because the incel movement presents a domestic

terrorism threat. This has been recognized not only by the FBI, but by numerous other organizations throughout the world, that the incels are a terroristic group. A court in Canada found recently that they present a terroristic threat.

A case that the Court could look to is *Chris Cornell*. He was planning to do a shooting at the Capitol and was arrested when he bought a gun and prepared to travel to the Capitol. He got 25 years.

MR. MONAHAN: Judge, I don't believe these cases have been cited in any filing by the government. I mean --

THE COURT: You're correct, you're correct. Yeah.

The Court has not seen any evidence of these cases. I think if you wanted to cite them, there was plenty of time to file them in all of the pleadings in all of the time you had.

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Certainly, but two days ago, defense counsel introduced a case from another district prosecutor, you know, defended by their office, and so now it's become quite relevant to come up with comparable cases. The government's position is this is a landmark case, it's in its own realm. But if we need to compare cases, comparing them to civil rights offenses about which, you know, defense counsel didn't raise with, didn't raise Koch, didn't raise Chan, it seems appropriate that I'm allowed to respond with what I think would be a responsive case.

THE COURT: I don't think it's fair, Ms. Gaffney-Painter.

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Okay. I'm happy to move on, Your Honor.

In the defense submission and today again, they call Mr. Genco's writings "dark thoughts," and I want to talk about what those dark thoughts are. At one point, defense counsel said there were only three writings; that's not correct. So let's actually engage with the dark thoughts that we're talking about here.

Searching Mr. Genco's web history, e-mails, and text messages, there were 3,487 items containing the word "incel." He posted over 450 times on an incel message board, and I'd like to read some of those, a very small selection of the numerous posts that he placed there.

Quote, "I sprayed some foids with three-week-old orange juice unintentionally on ER's birthday." That's a reference to Elliot Rodger, the mass shooter. "Their screams were amazing. They were mega Stacy's too. Felt like I was spiritually connected to the saint on that day. I drove up to them saying hi and they didn't even look up, they just went huh-uh, so they get sprayed in the fucking face. I suggested to all incels, supremely inspiring action," unquote. Quote, "ha-ha, what a cuck, he got a girl on his dick and she's trying to inflate his micro penis, any normal

1 dude would have grabbed her by the hair and literally 2 slammed her face into it. This sounds like a fake attention 3 whoring, teehee. I am so cute and naive, but still a whore story on the foids end," unquote. 4 5 THE COURT: Where are these things that you're 6 reading from? 7 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: These are postings that he 8 made on the incel site, which are also cited in our 9 sentencing memoranda. 10 MR. MONAHAN: If we could get dates that these 11 occurred so we can get a frame of reference. 12 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: These are outlined in our 13 sentencing memorandum submitted months ago. These are 14 postings on incel. I don't have the exact date, but they're 15 in the time frame that he identified as an incel. He pled 16 to a certain date range. All of the posts that I'm reading 17 now were outlined in the sentencing submission. 18 THE COURT: All right. I'll take your word for 19 that. 20 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Quote, "I saw a husband 21 grabbing his wife by the shoulders and shaking her and then 22 slapping her in public while I was night walking at 23 3:00 a.m. I didn't do shit about it. Foid chose that fate, 24 ha-ha." And then post quote, "revenge will be sweeter than 25 any woman," end quote.

He published a Kik message to a public group called hashtag sociopathsclusterB. In that, he wrote: "I was in an incel that got removed for saying I wanted to rape women. I said I wanted to kidnap women and rape/murder them." When did he post that? When he was in Georgia for basic training getting that arms training that was on his to-do list.

He conducted numerous troubling web searches which we've covered before, including, quote: "When I see a woman, I wonder what her head would look like on a stick." And then he saved a number of disturbing pictures and memes on his phone, a couple of which we admitted with our sentencing submission. This is Government Exhibit A to the sentencing submission. This is Adam Lanza depicted here who was responsible for the Sandy Hook mass shooting.

MR. MONAHAN: Was that "A"? I'm sorry, I'm just trying to hear.

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: "A."

MR. MONAHAN: Thank you.

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: (Indicating.) This is a redacted version of the picture that was found on his phone. This is attached to government's sentencing submission, Government Exhibit B. These are more than dark thoughts. This is more than dark thoughts or even dark threats. These are dark plans. He did dark plans. The Court covered this earlier in this proceeding outlining all of the steps both

in your order and in your oral recitation here to the defendant of the steps that he took that showed he absolutely, consistent with his plea, intended to carry this out. So we have these dark plans, the to-do list that he was following.

We also have dark steps taken in furtherance of those plans. (Indicating.) This is a photograph, this was attached to the government sentencing submission, Government Exhibit C, shows him modeling the mask. Here he is posing with his hands and the gun and the mask.

(Indicating.) This is Government Exhibit G. This was attached to our sentencing submission. This shows one of the modified weapons. This is the trunk of his car. As Your Honor pointed out in your order, this suggests that this plan was imminent and he was preparing to execute his plan. And then there's another modified weapon, this was found in his bedroom. This is Government Exhibit H that was attached to our sentencing submission.

By painting this as simply dark thoughts and making arguments about Federalism and bringing up cases decided after his plea about attempt, it's a walking back, it's a walking back of what was admitted to here, and even his submission to the Court attempts to explain away or walk back what he did here. In that submission, this is page 5, he claims that the ADHD medication that he was placed on led

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to, quote, "a cascade of blunders" one, quote, "which resulted in the discovery of my long forgotten, I was shooked to my core and recall breaking down crying in the ensuing interrogation pleading that I had not intended to I still plead and will to the end of my days," end quote. But that is directly in conflict with what he said here before you under oath. Quote, "Genco considered himself a member of the incel movement. Genco formulated a plot to kill women and intended to carry it out." As you wrote in your order, quote, "although his admissions are enough, the Court also notes that Genco took many steps that set forth in the PSR." "In short, he had acquired and prepared the means to complete his plot, and having weapons and ammunition in his vehicle suggests to the Court that he was getting ready to act." And, finally, very well said: "His conduct is more reprehensible than an attempted hate crime."

Even by the Court's recognition, this is a case in and of itself. This is not comparable to an attempted hate crime; it is more reprehensible. And the seriousness of this crime, set aside everything else, if we just focused on the 3553(a) factor that is about the seriousness of the offense, just that alone is sufficient to support the presumptively reasonable cap proposed here by the parties, which is 150 months; that is middle of the guidelines here. A variance is not warranted. The crime alone, but we also

have all of the other factors, including general and specific deterrence, and including no recognition at any point of the true depth of what the Defendant was engaged in and what he planned. There is just minimisation from start to finish, except in his plea agreement.

For all of these reasons and the reasons outlined in our numerous submissions, Your Honor, we submit that no variance is warranted here and sentencing him to the presumptively reasonable middle of the guidelines 150-month sentence is what's warranted by this conduct.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Gaffney-Painter.

Mr. Monahan, if you're going to be a while, do you want a break first?

MR. MONAHAN: I don't need one. I can probably be done in about 5 minutes, Judge. I just have a few points.

THE COURT: Okay, that's fine.

MR. MONAHAN: Let's leave that on, Bill. I actually want to put an item up.

I want to correct a few things that I do think are important to be corrected. Ms. Gaffney largely dismissed paying attention to the state case because she said that they didn't have the evidence in the state that we have federally, and I believe she even said the words they had "no forensic evidence." I believe that to be completely untrue.

I obtained the discovery that the state attorney had in state court. They actually had the FBI Domestic Terrorism Case Mobile Device Extraction and Analysis, which was prepared April of 2020. That was one month after his arrest. That was five months before sentencing. I think that that was just an inaccurate statement to the Court.

I'm also going to point out that in this packet that I received, we have the mask that was found in the phone. We have the picture she just showed you as an exhibit found in the phone in April of 2020. We have the gun picture. We have the unfortunate picture of the two naked women with the gun on a bed. These are pictures she just showed you acting like this is new evidence they have. They had this in state court, they had it in April of 2020.

It is simply not correct that the state didn't have all of the evidence. They had all of the same things she's showing you today in a forensic report prepared in April of 2020, so please don't pay attention to that distraction.

The Greece list, the one-page list she showed you with the handwriting, that was written in August of 2019. It is one page. We know he was largely incarcerated (sic) on that trip, that was September, October, November, December, January, February, March, seven months before his arrest, nine months before the May date. There was a one-line about a May date in that letter, nine months before that.

Remember what Ferguson said, Government, show me one case where an attempt has been supported by something that had happened more than a month before the incident. Nine months.

The hideous symphony document that she showed you that was typewritten and put on the overhead, that was written, according to the indictment, on August 3rd of 2019, again, seven months before arrest, nine months before May, while he's in Greece. So again, yes, they're bad-sounding documents, I'm not telling you they don't sound bad, just consider the context and the time frame in which they were written.

And now fast forward to he's doing -- he's writing messages that the government found in his phone that he's no longer involved with incel, he's trying to get away from incel, he doesn't like how violent these are. These are not self-serving messages he's telling you. These are things that he has written and that they found in his phone. They could argue to you it's self-serving. Incel isn't even in his mind anymore. He didn't write about incel because it's not a part of his life anymore.

I have to mention the Whitt case. Ms. Gaffney-Painter again minimized the Whitt case and she actually said the words to you: Well, the candle being lit with the gas being left on and the smoke detector being pulled out, she said

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that was an apartment that was abandoned at the time so it had no risk of hurting anybody. I just wanted to read you what she wrote in her sentencing memo about that. African American male returned from Thanksqiving vacation to check on his two-family property on Seton Avenue in Price What he encountered at the Price Hill house was an exceedingly disturbing crime. Cans of paint were splattered on the walls, stairs and appliances. Large holes were beaten in walls. The stairwell bannisters were broken. carpet was torn. Quikrete had been poured in the drains and toilets. The plumbing traps were removed from two sinks and the water was left running causing the ceiling to collapse. The floor sustained water damage and the basement flooded. A butcher knife was menacingly stabbed in the floor." The gas stove on the second floor unit -- again, acknowledging this is one of the two units in the building. I'm not sure how this didn't risk hurting somebody. "The gas stove to the second floor unit was left with on with a candle next to it while the smoke alarm above had been ripped off the Spray painted anonymous -- I'm sorry, ominously on the walls were the messages -- and I pardon me for the language, I'm just reading it, I'm just going to say die with the "N" word, the "N" word written several times, white power, slum lord, and swastikas.

So again, her interpretation of the facts at the time

of the case is significantly more egregious than her interpretation of the facts here before you. And I'm not sure how a two-family dwelling where this was on the second floor, that won't be a risk of harm to someone, even if that particular apartment wasn't occupied at the time.

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Your Honor, just as a point of clarity, neither apartment was occupied. And I, of course, stand by everything I wrote in that sentencing submission. That crime was incredibly disturbing, deserved a significant sentence, but it wasn't attempted murder.

MR. MONAHAN: She read you a bunch of posts, I don't know what those dates were. I'm speculating they were way back in August of 2019, but it's impossible to tell.

Maybe it was in Greece, I don't know.

I think after listening to all of that, a comment to make is Mr. Genco in all of this never actually encountered a woman. He never threatened a woman. He never interacted with a woman. He did all of this stuff in his imaginary online world. It's still disturbing and it's still wrong, but just keep that perspective. It's one thing to go do a crime, it's another thing to talk a lot about doing a crime and think about doing a crime, which is what he did. I'm not trying to, you know, candy coat this more than it can be candy coated, but I do want to point out that the man never encountered a woman. He didn't share any of these thoughts

1 with a woman. No victim knew that he had these thoughts, 2 not one. 3 Finally, I want to say the government kind of finished telling you that a sentence within the guideline range is 4 5 presumptively reasonable, and I've heard prosecutors say 6 this before. I want to be very clear, that is an appellate standard, that is not the standard that a district judge 7 8 applies. I have to consider the guidelines to be 9 presumptively reasonable. What you must do is determine a 10 sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary 11 to meet the statutory purposes of sentencing, and I didn't 12 want that indication about presumptive reasonableness to 13 sway you in any way because, candidly, that's not what this 14 Court considers. 15 I have nothing further to add. I do want to remind that Mr. Genco does need to be afforded an opportunity for 16 17 allocution and that I am completed with my presentation. 18 THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry, did I not give him an 19 opportunity? 20 MR. MONAHAN: Yes, we never got back to him 21 actually to allocute. 22 THE COURT: I apologize. 23 MR. MONAHAN: Which is fine, we were going to do it 24 last anyway. 25 THE COURT: Yes.

1 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Your Honor, may I have a 2 brief moment to respond just to a single point raised in Mr. 3 Monahan's presentation? THE COURT: All right. 4 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: He said that at no point 5 6 during this case did Mr. Genco encounter a woman, and, as 7 you know, that's not correct. This whole case came to our 8 attention because he threatened his mother. His mother 9 heard him cocking a gun in his room and he had threatened to 10 harm her, and she called 911 to report it. So he did 11 encounter a woman, she did feel fear, and that's how this case started. 12 13 MR. MONAHAN: He was not even charged with domestic 14 violence, to my knowledge, so that could have been a state 15 misdemeanor domestic violence charge, but that was never 16 pursued. So, yes, he encountered his mother daily, we would 17 certainly submit that that's true. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Genco, I'm sorry, anything 19 you would like to say, sir? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. Am I supposed to 21 stay at the podium? I don't know. 22 THE COURT: You can do it from wherever you're most 23 comfortable. If you're most comfortable sitting, fine. 24 you want to stand at the podium, that's fine too. 25 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. I want to kind of

reference something for the sake of interpretation. I didn't want to be misinterpreted. I completely disavow incel in any way, shape or form; I have from even before when was I was arrested. So I just wanted to kind of reference that. If I didn't properly reference that, that's a failure on my end.

Your Honor, to be before you today is my recognition of the deepest remorse, my greatest mistake, and also the grief upon which I inflict on those who I am blessed to call loved ones, friends, and family. This mistake is mine, I acknowledge fully. But I will not worsen it by failing to recognize this and let it evolve into a life-long collapse of responsibility. What I thought and wrote in delusion feels completely foreign to me. It is wrong in so many ways and is a betrayal to the person I've been all my life.

I'm so sorry for my actions and how I've affected others. This remorse has hurt me more than any brick wall or cold steel in this whole experience. Never will I permit the circumstances that have made the sun and sky stranger to me, never will I neglect and ignore my mental health again. My ignorance resulted in exponential pain and grief not conceivable in delirium, but painfully clear in sobering hindsight. The misery I have experienced has given way to clarity and perspective, and reflection has given me a life-long dedication to being the helping hand I wish I had

```
1
       in the past.
 2
            Your Honor, I implore you in only the way whose fate is
 3
       in your hands may that you do not see me for the boy I was,
 4
       but the man I am today. I am pleading for the opportunity
 5
       for redemption. Any chance I may have to develop, whether
 6
       it be referencing my mental health with therapy or
7
       furthering my education or working as I was in the halfway
 8
       house, you will see me work vigorously. My aspiration is
9
       that I may live a life that reflects empathy and compassion
10
       in every facet and to live a life that reflects love for
11
       this world.
12
            I feel like while a lot of the situation has been about
13
       me and about the mistakes I've made, but I've also hurt a
14
       lot of people coming here. I've hurt my family. I've hurt
15
       friends. I've -- of course, if I've caused any anxiety or
16
       stress to people, I just want to apologize. And that's all,
17
       Your Honor. Thank you for listening.
18
                THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Genco.
19
            Anything else?
20
                MR. MONAHAN: No, Your Honor.
21
                MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: No, thank you, Your Honor.
22
                THE COURT: We're going to take a 10-minute break.
23
                THE DEPUTY: All rise. Court is now in recess
24
       until 12:15.
25
            (Recess taken from 12:07 p.m. to 12:23 p.m.)
```

THE DEPUTY: All rise. This court is now in session pursuant to the recess. Please be seated.

MR. MONAHAN: Do you want us at the podium?

THE COURT: You're fine there.

MR. MONAHAN: Thank you, Judge.

pending for a long time, and that was primarily because this was an extremely serious allegation and I wanted to make sure that everything was completely investigated. I wanted to find out more about Mr. Genco's mental health, and the opinion of the doctor was helpful. I have given this a tremendous amount of thought already. When I compare him to the national statistics, I feel that the sentence I'm about to pronounce is comparative to those. Mr. Genco's allocution, I find him very sincere, one of the most sincere statements I've ever heard. I'm also impressed with the couple who is here whose son he befriended, that says a lot about the kind of person he's become.

This is a unique case, but I think I come out where the doctor who last examined you came out, that I believe in your rehabilitation and I think you have been and will continue to work on it. We judges wish we had a crystal ball and know how these things come out, but we don't. So we have to make our best judgment.

So it's the duty of the Court to sentence the Defendant

at this time; however, counsel will have a final chance to make legal objections before the sentence is actually imposed. And for all of the reasons I've just mentioned -- let me find one thing here.

(Pause.)

I've looked at the guidelines. Mr. Genco is currently a 33, I. If I go back to a 30, which is still a very significant amount of time, instead of being a 135 to 168, the sentence would be 97 to 121 months, and I feel that's much more in line with the national statistics than the suggestion of what a 33 is.

For that reason, and pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, and 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a), it's the judgment of the Court that Mr. Genco is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons -- I would give you, Mr. Genco, a 97-month sentence, which is what you would get if you were -- if the crime were a 30, which is very significant offense, and Criminal History I, but since you served already 17 months for exactly the same conduct, I think you should get credit for that time. I know the Bureau of Prisons would not give you credit for time that you served in state custody. I often do this, if the Bureau of Prisons is not going to give credit for the time served in state custody for exactly the same conduct, I deduct that from the sentence that goes to the Bureau of

Prisons.

So you were in state custody for 17 months. I'm deducting that from the 97, so I come up with a final amount of 80 months. And that would be if this were an offense level of 30 instead of a 33, which I don't think is much of a variance.

Upon release, you shall serve a term of supervised release of five years, which is also another way to build in some security that you will continue to keep your mental health up. Within 72 hours of release from imprisonment, you must report to the probation office in the district to which you are released.

During your term of imprisonment, the Court believes you would benefit from mental health treatment, vocational training, and an apprenticeship program.

While on supervision, you must not commit another federal, state or local crime. You're prohibited from possessing a firearm, ammunition, destructive device, or dangerous weapon. You must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance. You must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. The Court finds a low risk of future substance abuse on the part of the Defendant; and, therefore, pursuant to 18 United States Code Section 3583D, the Court is waiving the requirement of mandatory drug testing. You must cooperate in the collection of DNA as

directed by the probation officer.

And you need to comply with the standard conditions of supervision that have been adopted by this court as well as the following special conditions. First, you need to -- you should participate -- the Court is going to order that you do participate in a program of mental health assessment and/or counseling as directed by the United States probation office until such time as you are released from the program by the probation office. You shall make a copayment for treatment services not to exceed \$25 per month, which will be determined by your ability to pay.

Second condition is that you shall participate in a vocational services program as directed by the probation officer, and this is all when you get out from prison. Such program may include on-the-job training, job readiness training, and skills development training. I think you'll be in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons certainly for enough time to be able to take one or two apprenticeship programs. So you'll have the opportunity to learn something that you can do that you can use as for employment on the outside.

It's ordered that you shall pay a special assessment in the amount of a hundred dollars, which is due immediately.

And, finally, the Court considers the sentence to be just and reasonable in light of the Defendant's conduct and

1 the applicable sentencing factors. 2 I have some questions, Mr. Genco, I want to ask you. 3 can make a recommendation as to which prison facility you be sent to. Normally, it's a geographic recommendation, like 4 5 closest to Cincinnati, but if for some reason, you want to 6 go to another institution that has different apprenticeship 7 programs or whatever, I can request that. The Bureau of 8 Prisons does not have to follow my recommendation, but they 9 generally try to do so, if they can. 10 MR. MONAHAN: He did, Judge, actually do some 11 research related to programming that he might be interested 12 And he would like you to recommend either Milan, which is Michigan, M-I-L-A-N, Michigan, or Elkton, E-L-K-T-O-N. 13 14 THE COURT: Wait, say that again. 15 MR. MONAHAN: Elkton, E-L-K-T-O-N, Ohio. 16 THE COURT: Yes, I'm familiar with Elkton. The 17 Court will recommend Milan, Michigan, or Elkton, Ohio. 18 I'd also like to recommend that you participate in any 19

type of apprenticeship program that's offered by the Bureau of Prisons. Do you want me to make that recommendation?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Is there a particular apprenticeship program you want me to recommend you for?

THE DEFENDANT: If there's a possibility for any college credit or courses, I'd be grateful to have that

opportunity.

THE COURT: I'll put that in there, you know, college courses, if possible, if available, in addition to the apprenticeship program.

I also want to recommend one more thing. I know I've recommended mental health counseling when you get out of prison. I'd also like to for you to have mental health counseling during the time you're in the Bureau of Prisons, and so I'm going to put that in the judgment and commitment order.

Mr. Monahan, do you have any objections as to why this sentence should not be imposed as stated?

MR. MONAHAN: We're not -- we're going to add nothing. I mean, you heard all of our presentation earlier today and why we thought the sentence we requested was appropriate. I would comment that probation and the PSI actually recommended credit for the state sentence, so we appreciate you considering that and awarding that time.

THE COURT: Yeah. And I always do that, I think, you know, when somebody is serving time for exactly the same conduct, they ought to get credit for that, and I know the Bureau of Prisons doesn't give credit for state sentences, so I always do.

Ms. Gaffney-Painter, do you have any objections?

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Well, first, a point of

clarity. You mentioned going from a 33 to a 30; is that a departure or a variance, Your Honor?

THE COURT: A variance.

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: A variance, all right. The government does have objections to the sentence. First, we lodge an objection under 18 U.S.C. 3553(a)(2). We also lodge an objection under Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a)(6). And we also lodge an objection to the determination that making a terroristic threat in state is the exact same crime as an attempted hate crime.

THE COURT: Would you explain what 3553(a)(2) and (a)(6) are?

MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: Sure. 3553(a)(2) involves the seriousness of the offense and also the deterrence that must be considered when evaluating the sentence. (a)(6) is to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

All right. I need to advise you of your appellate rights, Mr. Genco. Under some circumstances, you have a right to appeal a sentence. However, a defendant may waive that right as part of a plea agreement, and you have entered into a plea agreement which waives some or all of your rights to appeal the sentence itself. Such waivers are generally enforceable, but if you believe the waiver itself is not valid, you can present that theory to the appellate

1 court. If you're indigent and cannot retain a lawyer, you 2 may apply and one will be appointed to represent you on your 3 appeal. You're further advised that, in accordance with the 4 provisions of Rule 4B of the Rules of Appellate Procedure, 5 you must file your notice of appeal with the clerk of the 6 United States District Court within 14 days of the filing of 7 this judgment. 8 The Court does hereby advise you that, if you so 9 request, I can order the clerk of courts to prepare and file 10 immediately a notice of appeal on your behalf, or I can ask 11 Mr. Monahan to protect your appellate rights. Would you 12 like me to ask Mr. Monahan to do that? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. It's further ordered that 15 you need to notify the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Ohio within 30 days of any change in 16 17 resident or mailing address until the special assessment of 18 \$100 imposed by this judgment is fully paid. 19 Are there any other objections? 20 MS. GAFFNEY-PAINTER: No, thank you, Your Honor. 21 MR. MONAHAN: We have no further objections, Your 22 Honor. 23 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, everyone. Mr. Genco, 24 good luck to you. 25 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE DEPUTY: All rise. Court is now in recess until 2:00. (Proceedings concluded at 12:37 p.m.) CERTIFICATE In accordance with 28 U.S.C. Section 753, I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter prepared from my stenotype notes and that the transcript page format is in accordance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Lisa Conley Gungblut

O3/
LISA CONLEY YUNGBLUT, RDR, RMR, CRR, CRC 03/13/2024 DATE